

YAMAZAKI ET AL. - 10/693,910  
Client/Matter: 008312-0306572

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-7 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-7 are amended. No claims have been canceled. Claim 8-30 are newly added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-30 will remain pending.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 4-7 were objected to as having informalities. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 6 and 7 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Inomata et al. (US 2003/004560; hereafter "Inomata"). Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inomata and further in view of Ohkawa (US 2003/0038984; hereinafter "Ohkawa"). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inomata and further in view of Koyanagi et al. (US Patent No. 5,424,844; hereinafter "Koyanagi").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reason presented below.

#### I. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 4-7 were objected to as having informalities. Claims 1-2 and 4-7 have been amended to address these informalities. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of these objection.

#### II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-7 have been amended to address the indefiniteness issues. As such, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph rejections.

YAMAZAKI ET AL. - 10/693,910  
Client/Matter: 008312-0306572

### **III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 1, 6 and 7 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Inomata. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and, therefore, respectfully traverse the same.

Inomata discloses an encryption/decryption system having multiple terminals connected by a network (Fig. 1). Inomata discloses a display/input unit 46 (Fig. 4) and a display unit 602 (Fig. 6). However, Inomata remains silent regarding a screen display that is divided into at least two regions such that each of the two regions display information to a registrant of a device to control an industrial machine as recited by claim 1. Because Inomata clearly fails to teach such a limitation, Inomata cannot be construed as anticipating claim 1. In addition, because claims 6-7 depend from claim 1, claims 6-7 are patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claims 1, 6-7.

### **IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Applicants submit that none of the remaining applied references cure the deficiencies of Inomata noted above. As such, claim 1 cannot be construed as being unpatentable over Inomata in view of the applied references.

In particular, claims 2 and 4, which depend from claim 1, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inomata and further in view of Ohkawa. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and, therefore, respectfully traverse the same.

As discussed above, Inomata neither teaches or suggests the use of a screen display that is divided into at least two regions so that each of the two regions display information to a registrant of a device to control an industrial machine as recited by claim 1.

Ohkawa discloses an image processing apparatus that includes an image forming section 30 (Fig. 4). Ohkawa also discloses an display example of a setting image plane relating to an outside of a document erasure function (Fig. 9). Ohkawa does not, however, discuss or suggest that a screen display is divided into at least two regions so that each of the

YAMAZAKI ET AL. - 10/693,910  
Client/Matter: 008312-0306572

two regions display information to a registrant of a device to control an industrial machine as recited by claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Inomata and Ohkawa still fails to teach or suggest the limitation "wherein the screen display is divided into at least two regions so that each of the two regions display information to the registrant of the device to control the industrial machine," as recited in claim 1. Because claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1, claims 2, 4 are patentable for at least the same reasons given with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Similarly, claim 5, which depends from claim 1, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inomata and further in view of Koyanagi. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and, therefore, respectfully traverse the same.

Koyanagi discloses a copy machine managing system having a management unit 13 and an LCD of open-port 43 or an external displaying apparatus displaying information (Figs. 2, 7). Koyanagi, however, does not teach or suggest the use of a screen display that is divided into at least two regions so that each of the two regions display information to a registrant of a device to control an industrial machine.

Thus, the combination of Inomata and Koyanagi also fails to teach or suggest the limitation "wherein the screen display is divided into at least two regions so that each of the two regions display information to the registrant of the device to control the industrial machine," as recited in claim 1. Because claim 5 depends from claim 1, claim 5 is patentable for at least the same reasons given with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the §103(a) rejection of claims 5 be withdrawn.

#### V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections, and pass this application quickly to issue.

If there are any fees due for entry of this submission that are not otherwise accounted for, Applicant asks that any such fees be charged to our Deposit Account No. 03-3975, with reference to Order No. 008312/0306572.

YAMAZAKI ET AL. -- 10/693,910  
Client/Matter: 008312-0306572

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP



JEFFREY D. KARCESKI

Reg. No. 35,914

Tel. No. (703) 905-2110

Fax No. (703) 905-2500

Date: October 8, 2004  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2000

JDK:yo